UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,718	07/25/2001	Noriyuki Hori	Q65524	4071

7590 11/24/2004

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/911,718	HORI, NORIYUKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas R Taylor	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07/25/2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 July 1001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/30/2002*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 have been examined and are rejected.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-12, 17-29, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CollegeView.com's Search Service (http://web.archive.org/web/19970116182733/http://www.collegeview.com/, hereafter referred to as "CollegeView") and Beattie et al. (US Patent 5,659,742.)

5. As per claims 1 and 18, CollegeView teaches an electronic leaflet system, comprising:

an electronic leaflet generation step of making contents data related to leaflets concerning a plurality of educational organizations into electronic information through designation of various kinds of selection items set in a web site on the side of a server to generate and output an electronic leaflet by the web site of said server, (CollegeView, page 6, sample leaflet for Acadia University, and page 5 for hyperlink selection items)

a selection supporting step of selecting at least one electronic leaflet optimum for various conditions presented by one who wants sending of a leaflet among electronic leaflets and presenting the selected electronic leaflet to a client terminal on the side of the one who wants sending of a leaflet through an internet by the web site of said server, (CollegeView, page 2-4 for selection, page 6 for sample leaflet generation/presentation)

and an electronic leaflet browsing supporting step of, in response to a request of one who wants sending of a leaflet, automatically reproducing the contents contained in a sub-menu prepared in advance in the selected electronic leaflet in question on a display of the client terminal on the side of the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question to promote understanding of the contents prepared in the selected electronic leaflet in question (CollegeView, page 2-4 for selection, page 6 for sample leaflet generation/presentation.)

However, CollegeView fails to specifically teach an electronic leaflet data base management step of making said electronic leaflet generated and output into a data base having a predetermined layered structure and preserving the obtained electronic leaflet in an electronic leaflet data base. Beattie teaches a database storing multimedia

information made available for searching and retrieval (Beattie, column 8 line 60 to column 9 line 8.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined CollegeView and Beattie to provide a structured database and retrieval system of leaflets in the system of CollegeView, because doing so would enable desirable searching and retrieval of multimedia leaflet information. This is stated as referenced in the art (Beattie, column 1, lines 44-50.)

6. As per claims 2 and 19, CollegeView teaches the system wherein said electronic leaflet relates to attending-school or correspondence-class chairs and lecture meetings of a plurality of educational organizations such as universities, preparatory schools, professional schools, cultural schools and private schools for elementary/junior-high/high schools (CollegeView, page 1 and page 4.)

7. As per claims 3 and 20, CollegeView teaches the system wherein at least one optimum electronic leaflet is selected from among electronic leaflets according to various conditions presented by one who wants sending of a leaflet through designation of various kinds of selection items set in advance related to icons in the web site of said server (CollegeView, page 2-3.)

8. As per claims 4 and 21, Beattie teaches the system further comprising a user access authentication step of, when said one who wants sending of a leaflet accesses

the web site, checking right to access of the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question and when the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question has right to access, informing the web site of said server that access of the client terminal on the side of the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question to the web site of said server is allowed (Beattie, column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 15, and figures 3-4.)

9. As per claims 5 and 22, CollegeView-Beattie teaches the system wherein said selection supporting step further comprises:

a question step of receiving various conditions presented by one who wants sending of a leaflet (CollegeView, page 2-3) and who is allowed to access by said user access authentication step (Beattie, column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 15) by clicking an icon in the web site to designate each kind of selection items set in advance related to the icon in question (CollegeView, page 2-3,)

and an electronic leaflet presenting step of searching said electronic leaflet data base based on the received various conditions to select at least one electronic leaflet matched most to the various conditions input by the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question from among electronic leaflets accumulated in the electronic leaflet data base and present, for the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question, the selected electronic leaflet to said client terminal on the side of the one who wants sending of a leaflet through the internet (CollegeView, results of searches initiated from pages 2-3.)

10. As per claims 6 and 23, CollegeView-Beattie teaches the system wherein said selection supporting step further comprises:

a question step of receiving various conditions presented by one who wants sending of a leaflet (CollegeView, page 2-3) and who is allowed to access by said user access authentication step (Beattie, column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 15) by clicking an icon in the web site to designate each kind of selection items set in advance related to the icon in question through the internet (CollegeView, page 2-3,)

and an electronic leaflet presenting step of searching said electronic leaflet data base based on the various conditions received from said question step to select a predetermined number of electronic leaflets in descending order of suitability for the various conditions input by the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question from among electronic leaflets accumulated in the electronic leaflet data base and present the selected electronic leaflets to the client terminal on the side of the one who wants sending of a leaflet (CollegeView, results of searches initiated from pages 2-3.)

11. As per claims 7 and 24, CollegeView teaches the system further wherein said electronic leaflet browsing supporting step comprises a movie reproduction step of, when an electronic leaflet in which moving picture data, voice data and/or document data are prepared as contents in advance is selected by one who wants sending of a leaflet, automatically reproducing the moving picture data, voice data and/or document data in question on the display of the client terminal on the side of the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question to promote understanding of the contents prepared in

the selected electronic leaflet (CollegeView, page 6, wherein the school information is a reproduction of the original server's leaflet page.)

12. As per claims 8 and 25, CollegeView teaches the system wherein said moving picture data, voice data and/or document data include data generated by editing scenes of school lessons recorded in the past in attending-school or correspondence-class chairs and lecture meetings held by educational organizations such as a university, a preparatory school and a private school (CollegeView, page 4, wherein "multimedia presentations" are available for each school.)

13. As per claims 9 and 26, CollegeView teaches the system wherein said moving picture data, voice data and/or document data include data generated by editing interview scenes recorded in the past of lecturers in charge of attending-school or correspondence-class chairs and lecture meetings held by educational organizations such as a university, a preparatory school and a private school (CollegeView, page 4, wherein "multimedia presentations" are available for each school.)

14. As per claims 10 and 27, CollegeView teaches the system wherein said moving picture data, voice data and/or document data include data generated by recording and editing interview scenes of students who took attending-school or correspondence-class chairs and lecture meetings held by educational organizations such as a university, a

preparatory school and a private school in the past (CollegeView, page 4, wherein "multimedia presentations" are available for each school.)

15. As per claims 11 and 28, CollegeView teaches the system wherein said moving picture data, voice data and/or document data include data generated by editing teaching materials and transcripts of lectures for attending-school or correspondence-class chairs presented by educational organizations such as a university, a preparatory school and a private school in the past (CollegeView, page 4, wherein "multimedia presentations" are available for each school.)

16. As per claims 12 and 29, CollegeView teaches the system further 12 wherein various kinds of selection items set in advance at said question step include a condition related to at least one of ability and qualification required for taking attending-school or correspondence-class chairs and lecture meetings held by educational organizations such as a university, a preparatory school and a private school, budget, school lesson schedule and qualifying schedule (CollegeView, page 2-3, specifically where the Student Body Type field is a qualification.)

17. As per claim 17 and 34, Beattie teaches the system wherein when chargeable said moving picture data, voice data and/or document data are sent to chargeable one who wants sending of a leaflet through the internet, said charging step executes processing of charging the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question (Beattie,

column 35, lines 37-41 and 59-67, wherein the subscriber information and databases permit charging users of the system.)

18. Claims 14-16 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CollegeView.com's Search Service (http://web.archive.org/web/19970116182733/http://www.collegeview.com/, hereafter referred to as "CollegeView") and Beattie et al. (US Patent 5,659,742), and Herr-Hoyman et al. (US Patent 5,727,156.)

19. As per claims 14 and 31, CollegeView-Beattie teaches the system above. However, CollegeView-Beattie fails to teach the system further comprising a charging step of charging an educational organization according to the volume of data at new registration or updating of contents data of an electronic leaflet conducted at said electronic leaflet generation step.

Herr-Hoyman teaches charging according to the volume of data at a new registration in a system that stores in an html database (Herr-Hoyman, column 4, lines 9-17.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined CollegeView-Beattie and Herr-Hoyman to provide charging at a new registration in the system of CollegeView-Beattie, because doing so would enable charging a fee from the user.

20. As per claims 15 and 32, Herr-Hoyman further teaches the system wherein said charging step charges an educational organization according to the volume of data at new registration or updating of contents data of an electronic leaflet made in said electronic leaflet data base (Herr-Hoyman, column 4, lines 9-17.)

21. As per claims 16 and 33, CollegeView-Beattie further teaches the system wherein when one who wants sending of a leaflet accesses the web site of said server side and right to access of the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question is checked, if the one who wants sending of a leaflet has chargeable right to access, said user access authentication step informs said charging step (Beattie, column 10 line 65 to column 11 line 15, and figures 3-4),

and said selection supporting step that access of the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question to chargeable moving picture data, voice data and/or document data is allowed, said selection supporting step receives, through said question step various conditions presented by one who wants sending of a leaflet and who is allowed to access by said user access authentication step by clicking an icon in the web site to designate each kind of selection items set in advance related to the icon in question (CollegeView, results of searches initiated from pages 2-3,)

and searches said electronic leaflet data base based on the various conditions received through said electronic leaflet presenting step to select a chargeable electronic leaflet matched most to the various conditions input by the one who wants sending of a

leaflet in question from among chargeable electronic leaflets accumulated in the electronic leaflet data base (CollegeView, results of searches initiated from pages 2-3)

and present, for the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question, the selected electronic leaflet to said client terminal on the side of one who wants sending of a leaflet through the internet, and said charging step charges the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question according to conditions of access to a chargeable electronic leaflet (CollegeView, page 6.)

22. Claims 13 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CollegeView.com's Search Service (http://web.archive.org/web/19970116182733/http://www.collegeview.com/, hereafter referred to as "CollegeView") and Beattie et al. (US Patent 5,659,742), and further in view of Fields et al. (US Patent 6,347,943.)

23. As per claims 13 and 30, CollegeView-Beattie teaches the system as described above. However, CollegeView-Beattie fail to teach the mock examination system of claims 13 and 30.

Fields teaches the system wherein said question step comprises: a mock examination sending step of, when one who wants sending and who is allowed to make an access by said user access authentication step clicks a mock examination icon enabling selection of a mock examination for supporting self-determination of basic scholastic ability and/or aptitude required for taking attending-school or correspondence-class chairs and lecture meetings held by educational organizations

such as a university, a preparatory school and a private school, (Fields, column 3, lines 46-59, specifically the "assessment mechanism" used in relation to a college course)

sending question data of the mock examination to the client terminal on the side of the one who wants sending of a leaflet in question through the internet, and a mock examination determination step of receiving answer data from one who wants sending of a leaflet to mark the answer data, (Fields, column 3, lines 46-59, specifically the "assessment mechanism" used in relation to a college course, and figure 8)

generating various conditions including current ability of the one who wants sending of a leaflet, ability required for taking a chair or a lecture meeting, a kind of chair or lecture meeting recommended and a specific name of a chair or a lecture meeting based on the marking result and outputting the conditions to said electronic leaflet browsing supporting step (Fields, column 3, lines 46-59, specifically the "customized learning pathway" previously authored by a course content author such as a college professor, and figure 8.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined CollegeView-Beattie and Fields to provide a mock examination method in the system of CollegeView-Beattie, because doing so would allow each user to select a customized course of instruction based on assessment of each user's knowledgeability of a particular topic. This is stated as referenced in the art (Fields, column 1, lines 6-10.)

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. This includes US Patents 6,507,726, 6,347,333, and 5,820386.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas R Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Taylor
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2141

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER